



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/068,119	02/06/2002	Feniosky Pena-Mora	MIT-086AUS	5759
22494 7590 06/25/2007 DALY, CROWLEY, MOFFORD & DURKEE, LLP SUITE 301A 354A TURNPIKE STREET CANTON, MA 02021-2714			EXAMINER STEVENS, THOMAS H	
			ART UNIT 2121	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/25/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Advisory Action</b> <b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/068,119	<b>Applicant(s)</b> PENA-MORA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Thomas H. Stevens	<b>Art Unit</b> 2121	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 15 June 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b) ☒ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
 5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
 6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
 7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
 The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
 Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
 Claim(s) objected to: 5.  
 Claim(s) rejected: 2-4,6,8-11,13,15-23.  
 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
 9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
 13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

  
**Anthony Knight**  
**Supervisory Patent Examiner**  
**Group 3600**

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: claims 2-6,8-11 and 13-23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The disclosure is silent to the following limitation (independent claims 17 and 23): "...wherein the first and second activity data are associated with the first and second mutually exclusive activities, respectively".

Applicants are correct regarding in the distinction of "automatic identifying and automatically updating" relative to the prior art of Pollalis. However, the Office stands firm with the prior art's teaching of "activities; first, second (can be any activity), etc." since Pollalis teaches and/or suggest project planning i.e., precedence diagram method (PDM) and graphical evaluation and review technique (GERT) which are well known. As stated previously, the disclosure is, verbatim, silent to the first and second activities as mutually exclusive.

The examiner equates "production type value" and "task activities"; the task activities are clearly denoted in figure 4 of Pollalis (i.e., Quantified Bars;) with a production type value (i.e., "Necessary Manpower"; "Number in Crew"). In each case, a numerical value is represented.

Applicants define "policy value" or "policy data values" as project policies such as manpower availability vs. time values, overtime and flexibility of worker headcount control values (specification, pg. 12, line s 29-30) to which Pollalis teaches or suggest manpower elements (e.g., no. in crew, etc.), in figure 4.

Applicants' arguments regarding the downstream of the plurality of activities with the reliability buffer is persuasive to obviate the rejection to this limitation. However, the Office stands firm in anticipation of the dependency matrix structure GUI since one of ordinary skill in the art in management task structure would deduce figures 21-23 and the properties of critical path method (CPM) and PERT (column1, lines 23-31) of Pollalis as common network based project planning models (applicants' specification, pg. 2, lines 1-12). Furthermore, the DMP (dynamic planning processor) encompasses the CMP and PERT with its project plan database that is executable on a computer-based processor.

Applicants' response to the objection to claim 5 is acknowledged; but since other issues in the independent claims remain outstanding, the objection to claim 5 stands.